DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 276 103 EA 018 720

AUTHOR Hord, Shirley M.; Hall, Gene E.
TITLE Institutionalization of Innovations: Knowing When You Have It and When You Don't. R&D Report 3220.
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO R&DCTE-R-3220
PUB DATE Apr 86
NOTE 28p.; In: School Improvement: Messages from Five Years of Research. Symposium presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (67th, San Francisco, California, April 16-20, 1986); see EA 018 717.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Role; Adoption (Ideas); Change Strategies; *Educational Innovation; Elementary Secondary Education; *Measurement Techniques; Policy Formation; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; *Program Implementation; *Teacher Response

ABSTRACT

Although vast numbers of educational innovations have been introduced into the nation's schools over the past 20 years, few have succeeded in effecting affective, behavioral, and cognitive student gains. Many recent studies have focused, therefore, on school change processes and the formulation of strategies for successful innovation implementation. These studies, however, have not formulated the means for determining if, or how, individual teachers have integrated innovation into their regular classroom practice. This paper offers a definition of institutionalization that addresses this problem, first by describing five subprocesses (assessment of present practices, response adoption, initiation, implementation, and institutionalization); then by offering a set of three vectors for describing innovation use (Stages of Concern, Levels of Use, and Innovation Configuration); and finally by explaining how these vectors can be used to determine if an innovation has become institutionalized. The paper concludes with implications for policy determination, intervention, and evaluation. A list of 27 references is appended. (IW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED276103

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF INNOVATIONS:

KNOWING WHEN YOU HAVE IT AND WHEN YOU DON'T

Shirley M. Hord
Gene E. Hall

Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
The University of Texas at Austin

(R&D Report 3220)

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the
American Educational Research Association
San Francisco, 1986 (April)

The research described herin was conducted under contract with the National Institute of Education. The opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education and no endorsement by the National Institute of Education should be inferred.

EA 018 720

INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF INNOVATIONS: KNOWING WHEN INDIVIDUALS HAVE IT AND WHEN THEY DON'T

Shirley M. Hord
Gene E. Hall

It is no secret that would-be educational reformers for two decades have been fraught with frustration. A plethora of educational innovations have been delivered to the nation's schools, with generally disappointing results in terms of their outcomes for improving affective, behavioral and cognitive student gains. One result has been closer scrutiny of proposed innovations and attention to better understanding school change processes, and to formulating strategies for successful innovation implementation.

For more than a decade, we and our colleagues have studied schools in their efforts to establish new school practices, practices which hopefully would lead to greater gains for students. One of the important results of our studies has been the identification and verification of a set of vectors that can be employed to diagnose, monitor and guide the change process. In this paper, we present the three vectors as a set of benchmarks for describing innovation use; importantly, we explain how they can be used also for determining if an innovation has become established as regular practice or "institutionalized."

In the past, we have not had the means for determining if, or how, individual users of an innovation have integrated it into their regular classroom practice, and this dilemma has been frequently expressed in the literature. Thus, we propose in this paper, a definition of institutionalization which addresses this problem. As a prelude, however, we will briefly review the process of school change, empha-

sizing its subprocesses: assessment, adoption, initiation, implementation and institutionalization. We will also provide an overview of the literature, in search of insights about institutionalization, giving particular attention to definitions of this phase of the change process. Following that, we propose an operational schema for defining and assessing institutionalization. We then conclude with implications for policy determination, intervention and evaluation.

Change: Five Subprocesses

Although the change process in operation cannot be explicitly portrayed as a linear set of discrete phases, for purposes of practical examination and for discussion of the relationships of institutionalization within the change process, it is convenient to do so. The phases do indeed follow in a sequence, but they are cyclical and interactive, and one phase does not necessarily end before the next begins.

Assess Present Practice

A new program, process, or product--an innovation--may come to a school by way of a bottom-up strategy, that is, several teachers or a whole faculty work together to generate the new practice. Or, it may arrive as a top-down mandate. In either case, the innovation's arrival results from a review of the school's (or larger unit's) current performance. Relevant data may be broadly collected and analyzed to identify strengths and weaknesses in the school's or district's academic and non-academic programs and procedures; or, in a more focused way, information may be sought only for a particular purpose. Whether information gathering is broad or narrow, whether staff are widely or

modestly involved, a needs assessment is made and an area(s) in need of improvement is identified.

Adopt a Response

A second part of the change process focuses on the selection or development of a response to the identified need. The response is often accompanied by high expectations that it will "cure" the identified weakness. Many schools and districts currently are investing a great deal of resources in the development of new curricula and other innovations, in order to accommodate the needs and particularities of the given school or district context. Conversely, many schools and districts are electing an innovation that is already produced and packaged, albeit by commercial publisher, NDN, other schools, districts, etc. In either case, an innovation is selected and a decision is made to adopt it for use. We might just note here, that this rational process is not always employed; in some circumstances innovations are adopted because they are "good" and then a rationale is developed for why they are needed.

Initiation

In most school change and improvement efforts, a great deal of commitment and enthusiasm--on the part of some individuals--accompanies the introduction of the new practice. This fervor seems to accompany the innovation as it is brought into the system, and is the cause de celebre. Not infrequently, the innovation is launched by the organization or system's Chief Officer announcing its arrival and extolling its virtues and goodness. The intended users are exhorted to give the new practice a trial and efforts to develop user commitment are stimulated. The organization is mobilized to accommodate and promote

the innovation across the user system. The initiation phase has been analyzed, subdivided, discussed and abundantly described in the change literature. There appear to be available many more examples of initiating change in schools than there are of implementing (and institutionalizing) the change.

Implementation

Because typical implementation activities seldom support the innovation users sufficiently, the implementation phase, in retrospect, is often declared a non-event. However, in successful change it is a vital part of the change and improvement process. We have learned that the implementation phase should be supported by a set of activities for putting the innovation into practice, and as such implies skill training and one-on-one problem solving interventions, designed to help the individual learn to use the innovation (Stiegelbauer, Muscella & Rutherford, 1986). Thus, the provision of implementation assistance is critical. Translated into resources, this encompasses time, money, additional personnel, materials--and energy. Then just possibly, the implementation phase may be followed by institutionalization. However, just as there are fewer examples of implementation than there are of initiation, there are even less studies that focus on institutionalization.

Institutionalization

As noted, institutionalization has been little studied and it has not been clear what it means in terms of the every day innovation operations of the individual innovation users and their typical classroom practice. Institutionalization is viewed as the goal of change and the end result of the prior phases of adoption, initiation

and implementation; however, it has been difficult to know when institutionalization was reached, or if it was, and descriptions and analyses of this part of change have not been abundant.

We now turn to the brief literature on institutionalization, this phase of the school change process that appears so elusive.

Reviewing the Literature: A Short Past

Until recently neither researchers nor school practitioners have given much time or attention to the institutionalization phase of change efforts. Miles (1983) reviewed the literature to address the question, why do some innovations get "built in" (page 14) to the life of the school, and others just disappear. Miles' review is a useful one. And although he reports that the data about institutionalization are scant, the reader is encouraged to refer to his remarks about the work of Yin, et al. (1978, 1979), Corbett, Dawson & Firestone (1982), Glaser (1981), Louis, et al. (1981), Howes (1977) and Berman and McLaughlin (1978). Miles opines that past research has given unbalanced attention to "user skill" to the detriment of understanding "organization-level structural and procedural changes required for institutionalization" (page 16). Thus, in Miles' research and analysis of the DESSI Study (Study of Dissemination Efforts Supporting School Improvement, Crandall and Associates, 1982), he looked for organizational conditions that supported institutionalization. These he conceptualized in a chart drawn from the work of Yin and others (1978, 1979).

The chart is organized into three groups of factors. The first is supporting conditions, such as "operates on a regular, daily basis" and "competing practices eliminated." A second grouping is labeled passage completion, organizational conditions such as "goes from soft to hard

money" and "routines established for supply and maintenance." The third category of Miles' chart of organizational conditions that support institutionalization is labeled cycle survival and includes factors such as "survives annual budget cycles" and "survives departure or introduction of new personnel" (1983, page 16).

One of the factors in the cycle survival group on the chart, "achieves widespread use throughout organization," (page 16) appears to us to be significantly important and we would wish to have this use variable defined. We believe, as Fullan and Park (1981) suggest, that people (skills, beliefs) are often overlooked in the change process in favor of things (materials, guidelines). "People are much more difficult to deal with than things, they are also much more necessary for success" (page 13). At the individual classroom teacher level, it is not clear from Miles' chart how to know if "widespread use throughout organization" has been achieved.

An additional analysis by Miles resulted in the generation of a model of factors, organized into two groups of providing supports and warding off threats. This useful model illuminates our understanding of the variables involved in institutionalization, as defined by organizational conditions, user effort and innovation vulnerability. The analysis identifies factors that contribute to or predict that institutionalization will occur, or that the innovation has "settled down." In this regard, Miles has increased our understanding of this poorly understood phase of change.

Berman and McLaughlin (1978) also identified factors affecting implementation and continuation of innovations; these included the project's (or the innovation's) methods, the project resources, the scope of the project, implementation strategies, school organizational climate and leadership (role of principal), characteristics of schools and attributes of teachers ("years of teaching, sense of efficacy, and verbal ability," page VIII), and district management capacity and support. How to ascertain, however, when the innovation has become "built in," has "settled down," and has become institutionalized, is yet a mystery.

Ekholm and Trier (1985) indicate that institutionalization is a "process through which an organization assimilates an innovation into its structure" (page 2). Also focusing on the process, Van Hees (forthcoming) defines institutionalization as "the process of survival of the new practices and structures over time." The "innovation must be locked into the organizational setting of the school and into the minds of the users. It becomes part of the normal day to day routine and is not seen any more as something new or different requiring other materials, skills, or attitudes." Van Hees laments that the question of whether and when a new practice "has become a natural and persistent part of the school is not easy to answer. Some more objective measures could be used here."

To summarize, there is little in the literature on change that directly addresses institutionalization. Most of what is available focuses on the process, or what is required for the innovation's institutionalization. As Van Hees suggests, there is a need for measures that could be employed to know when one has reached institu-

tionalization. We now turn our attention to this dilemma.

Perspectives on Institutionalization

Various writers have viewed institutionalization as a process leading to a condition or point that has not yet been defined satisfactorily, though a variety of perspectives have been brought to the attempted definitions. Miles suggests "supports" and "threats" (that the innovation has experienced and overcome on its way to "built-in-ness,") and assimilation into the organizational structure is suggested by Ekholm and Trier. Van Hees talks about the process of "survival" and how different persons or groups may identify the moment in time when an innovation is institutionalized according to their perspective. For instance, a school building administrator thinks "of a new reading method as being fully institutionalized because it is part of the written curriculum, new material is brought and an in-service training program is carried out" (page 58). On the other hand a teacher in the same building with the same innovation "could think he is still implementing and doing experiments with the new method" (page 58). Van Hees suggests further that another teacher on the staff may think "he is not changing anything at all because he is doing everything the same as before and nobody notices it or says something about it" (page 58).

From the early rural sociology studies on change, institutionalization was viewed as the farmer planting hybrid corn seed (a very simple and uncomplicated innovation) followed by continued planting of hybrid corn seed. For the most part, the educational reformers of the last two decades have adopted a similar simplistic view and equated change and institutionalization with the presence of the innovation materials in the classroom and the completion of inservice

training. Unlike planting seed, implementing and institutionalizing educational innovations is highly complex.

Fullan and Pomfret (1977), however, brought new insights to the understanding of curriculum implementation (and indirectly institutionalization) in their review of studies on this topic. They pointed out that the user was an important unit of investigation and that despite organizational factors, how each individual was working with the innovation was an essential variable to take into account. They cited user behaviors, described by Hall and Loucks as Levels of Use (1977), as important to making this assessment.

Subsequent to Fullan and Pomfret's review, additional work described by Hall and Loucks focused on the parts of the innovation that the user was implementing and adapting as they put the innovation into use in their own classroom. The concept of Innovation Configuration (1978) made it possible to identify and describe operationally what the innovation looked like as it was implemented. Putting some of these perspectives together, Huling, Hall, Hord and Rutherford (1983) in a recent discussion of "implementation success," delineated a process for establishing and codifying the degree of implementation accomplished by an individual. This process makes it possible to compare the amount of innovation implementation of a user across varying points in time, compare one user against other users, compare a school against other school units, and against other innovations. Further, this process utilizes the same vectors that can be employed to measure and to determine when an individual has reached institutionalization, and if institutionalization continues.

A New Definition of Institutionalization

Because the literature has not provided an operational definition of institutionalization at the individual user level, we propose a way to define and measure whether you "have it" in terms of the individual user of an innovation. Whether we refer to this point in time as "built-in-ness," or "stabilization," or something else, the definition can apply.

Descriptions of Institutionalization

We propose to use, for the purpose of identifying institutionalization, three descriptive measures: 1) one that identifies how the user is feeling about, or reacting to the innovation, and 2) one that describes how the individual is using the innovation (these two vectors are "person" vectors) and, 3) a measure that describes the new program, process, or product in operation in the individual's classroom practice (the "innovation" vector). Descriptions of these concepts follow.

Stages of Concern. Stages of Concern (SoC) describes seven kinds of concerns that individuals experience with varying intensities as they experience the change process (Hall, Wallace, Dossett, 1973). These range from early concerns about "self," to concerns about "task," and finally to concerns about "impact" (Figure 1). A reliable and valid instrument for measuring Stages of Concern, the SoC Questionnaire, as well as methods for interpreting the measures (Hall, George & Rutherford, 1977), have been developed.

Figure 1

STAGES OF CONCERN:
TYPICAL EXPRESSIONS OF CONCERN ABOUT THE INNOVATION

	STAGES OF CONCERN	EXPRESSIONS OF CONCERN
IMPACT	6 REFOCUSING	I HAVE SOME IDEAS ABOUT SOMETHING THAT WOULD WORK EVEN BETTER.
	5 COLLABORATION	I AM CONCERNED ABOUT RELATING WHAT I AM DOING WITH WHAT OTHER INSTRUCTORS ARE DOING.
	4 CONSEQUENCE	HOW IS MY USE AFFECTING KIDS?
TASK	3 MANAGEMENT	I SEEM TO BE SPENDING ALL MY TIME IN GETTING MATERIAL READY.
SELF	2 PERSONAL	HOW WILL USING IT AFFECT ME?
	1 INFORMATIONAL	I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW MORE ABOUT IT.
	0 AWARENESS	I AM NOT CONCERNED ABOUT IT (THE INNOVATION).

Hall, G. E. & Rutherford, W. L. Concerns of teachers about implementing team teaching. Educational Leadership, December, 1976, 34(3), 227-233.

Hall, G. E. & Loucks, S. F. Teacher concerns as a basis for facilitating and personalizing staff development. Teachers College Record, September, 1978, 80(1), 36-53.

Research on the Improvement of Practice Division
Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
The University of Texas at Austin

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Levels of Use. Levels of Use (LoU) describes how performance changes as the individual becomes more familiar with an innovation and more skillful at using it. The Stages of Concern dimension focuses on perceptions or feelings about the innovation; Levels of Use focuses on whether or not and how the teacher is using an innovation. Eight distinct Levels of Use have been identified (Hall, Loucks, Rutherford & Newlove, 1975). Typically an individual begins with LoU 0 "nonuse" of the innovation, then moves to LoU I "orientation" about the innovation and LoU II "preparation" for use. Initial use is usually at LoU III "mechanical," but as experience increases, innovation users move to a LoU IVA "routine" level of use and eventually may reach various "refinement" levels (LoU IVB, V, VI), where changes are made based on formal or informal assessments of student needs (Figure 2). A focused interview procedure has been developed to measure Levels of Use (Loucks, Newlove & Hall, 1975).

Innovation Configurations. The third vector that is important in understanding and describing the change process is Innovation Configurations (IC) (Hall & Loucks, 1978; 1981). This concept is used to describe the various operational forms of an innovation that result as individual users adapt it for use in their particular situations. With this concept, the major operational components of an innovation are identified and the ways that each of the components can vary are described. These descriptions are summarized on an Innovation Configuration Component Checklist. The IC Component Checklist is innovation specific and can be used to record in what ways each potential user is using the various parts of the innovation (Figure 3).

Figure 2

LEVELS OF USE OF THE INNOVATION:

TYPICAL BEHAVIORS

LEVEL OF USE		BEHAVIORAL INDICES OF LEVEL
VI	RENEWAL	THE USER IS SEEKING MORE EFFECTIVE ALTERNATIVES TO THE ESTABLISHED USE OF THE INNOVATION.
V	INTEGRATION	THE USER IS MAKING DELIBERATE EFFORTS TO COORDINATE WITH OTHERS IN USING THE INNOVATION
IVB	REFINEMENT	THE USER IS MAKING CHANGES TO INCREASE OUTCOME
IVA	ROUTINE	THE USER IS MAKING FEW OR NO CHANGES AND HAS AN ESTABLISHED PATTERN OF USE.
III	MECHANICAL USE	THE USER IS USING THE INNOVATION IN A POORLY COORDINATED MANNER AND IS MAKING USER-ORIENTED CHANGES.
II	PREPARATION	THE USER IS PREPARING TO USE THE INNOVATION.
I	ORIENTATION	THE USER IS SEEKING OUT INFORMATION ABOUT THE INNOVATION.
0	NONUSE	NO ACTION IS BEING TAKEN WITH RESPECT TO THE INNOVATION.

Hall, G. E., Loucks, S. F., Rutherford, W. L., & Newlove, B. W. Levels of use of the innovation: A framework for analyzing innovation adoption. The Journal of Teacher Education, Spring, 1975, 24(1), 52-56.

Hall, G. E. & Loucks, S. F. A developmental model for determining whether the treatment is actually implemented. American Educational Research Journal, Summer, 1977, 14(3), 263-276.

Research on the Improvement of Practice Division
Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
The University of Texas at Austin

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Figure 3

Innovation Configuration Components and Variations of a

Continuous-Progress Mathematics Curriculum

Teacher _____ Rater _____

*I. Instructional Materials			
1. program materials only	2. program materials plus	3. text only	4. teacher-made materials only
II. Grouping			
1. completely individualized	2. small groups	3. large homogenous	4. large heterogenous
*III. Testing Component			
1. each student tests themselves as they complete each objective	2. testing done weekly with test results fed back to students	3. testing done once every six weeks--nothing done with test results	4. no regular testing except standardized achievement tests required by district

- - - To left of slashed line is ideal variation

_____ To left of solid line is acceptable variation

_____ To right of solid line is unacceptable variation

* Critical Components

When particular use of components is valued or rejected, this information can be reflected in the IC Checklist.

In combination these three vectors can be applied to users and nonusers of any innovation at any point in time. They can be utilized to establish minimum institutionalization, maximum institutionalization, or if a user is "not there yet." It should be noted that, for any particular innovation, some person or persons has the privilege or responsibility for using these dimensions to set the institutionalization standards for that innovation and this should be considered at the beginning of the change process. To describe these standards for maximum and minimum institutionalization, we will use the three vectors, Stages of Concern (SoC), Levels of Use (LoU), Innovation Configuration (IC).

Maximum or Ideal Institutionalization

Ideal institutionalization would be reached when the individual user and the use of the innovation can be described in these three ways:

Stages of Concern: Individuals (teachers) have experienced using the innovation for an extended period of time so that they are fully aware of the innovation's components and how to use them in their classroom. Thus, their Stages of Concern 1 and 2 and 3, Informational and Personal and Management, have been considerably decreased from their initial introduction to the innovation and its use. The teacher is no longer intensely interested in learning about the innovation, how using it will affect them personally, or how to make it work for them in their classroom. Ideal use or maximum institutionalization would be characterized by the user expressing more intense impact Stages of Concerns 4, 5, or 6--Consequence, Collaboration, Refocusing--all focused

on interests for increasing benefits for students from innovation use (see Figure 4).

Levels of Use: The individual teacher has moved beyond the non-use levels of Orientation and Preparation, and through the Mechanical Use period of inexperience with the innovation. Extended practice and experimentation time has led to stabilized use, Level of Use IVA Routine. Depending on the goals set for ideal use for the particular innovation in the particular setting, Routine Level of Use may constitute ideal use, or LoU IVB, V, or VI--Refinement, Integration, or Renewal--may be required for maximum use.

Innovation Configurations: The individual teacher has put into practice the preferred or ideal variation of all components of the innovation. For example in the IC Checklist in Figure 3, the teacher would be using the component variations exhibited to the left of the dashed line: using the math program materials only, using individualized math instruction as the "grouping" procedure, and using a testing process wherein students test themselves upon completion of each objective. No other variations would be considered as "ideal." Again, the ideal variants of using the innovation's components have been assessed and established.

In summary, maximum institutionalization is described as accomplished when individual teachers reach Stages of Concern 4 or above, reach Level of Use IVA or above, and are using the ideal variations of the innovation's components.

Minimum Institutionalization

Institutionalization can be described as a lower, but acceptable, quality of use by individuals, again by applying the three vectors:

Figure 4

Maximum and Minimum Institutionalization

	MAXIMUM	MINIMUM
SoC	1, 2, 3 decreased 4, 5, 6 increasing	1, 2, 3 decreased
LoU	IVA IVB, V, VI	IVA
IC	ideal variations	acceptable variations

Stages of Concern: Minimum institutionalization of an individual's use of an innovation could be decreed when the intensity of the individual's Stages of Concern 1, 2 and 3 have dropped from their typically high intensity at the beginning of a change effort. Whereas maximum institutionalization requires an elevation of SoC 4, 5, and/or 6, minimum institutionalization would be satisfied when the early intensities of Stages 1, 2, 3 have decreased.

Levels of Use: Minimum institutionalization would not be met until the user is rated at Level of Use IVA Routine; higher levels would not likely be characteristics of minimum institutionalization.

Innovation Configuration: Maximum institutionalization required the use of "ideal" variations of all the innovation's components; minimum institutionalization could be declared when the user has put "acceptable" variations of the critical components into place. Again, using Figure 3 as an example, the teacher is using those variations pictured to the left of the solid line: using program materials plus others, or text only (teacher-made materials only are not acceptable), using small groups (large groups for instruction are not an acceptable variation), and using a weekly testing process with results shared with students (six weeks tests are not acceptable, nor are standardized achievement tests only).

In brief, minimum institutionalization can be claimed when individual teachers' Stages of Concerns 1, 2, 3 have been reduced in intensity, Level of Use IVA has been reached, and the acceptable variations of the innovation components are used in classroom practice.

As a case example, see Rutherford (1985) who describes minimum institutionalization and "not there yet" practices (obviously less growth by teachers in the three measures than minimum institutionalization) in a study of three schools' use of a writing program during a four year period of time.

Implications

From a simplistic view of change, delivering the innovation was assumed to produce stabilized use and results. More recently we understand change as a complicated and complex process. The goal of this process is high quality institutionalization of the intended change. Being able to define institutionalization provides us with understandings and structures that can guide and influence our efforts directed toward this goal. We briefly discuss implications for several relevant areas.

Interventions

We have identified the Stages of Concern and Levels of Use standards for maximum and minimum institutionalization. We believe these SoC and LoU standards can be applied generically to all innovations. The Innovation Configuration standard, however, will be specific to each particular innovation. Ideal (or maximum) and acceptable (or minimum) variations of the IC components will be used as the IC standards and would be defined by the innovation developer or some other person who is closely involved with the innovation and who has the responsibility.

We have defined operationally our goal of a change effort in terms of the individual user, and groups of users, and we have described the means that make it possible to ascertain when we have reached the goal. More importantly, these same benchmarks can guide the design and delivery of interventions to individuals, to help them reach the goal of institutionalization. Measures of the individual's "concerns" provide the basis for determining interventions targeted at resolving self and task concerns, so that over time the individual reaches impact stages of concern about the innovation. Similarly, classroom use can be assessed and appropriate interventions designed. Thus, the vectors that are available to establish the institutional criteria are employed to provide the users with facilitative interventions, based on Stages of Concern, Levels of Use and Innovation Configuration data. The long range goal is institutionalized change; data-based interventions make it possible to effectively support individuals in their efforts to move toward institutionalization. Furthermore, in order to maintain institutionalization, data-based interventions must continue to be supplied.

Professional Development of Personnel

We believe that change has not completed its course until the innovation users have reached the point of institutionalization, as defined by the vectors. For this to happen, many types of interventions will be required for the users. The interventions will be delivered across time by knowledgeable, skillful change facilitators (Hall and Hord, 1986). Because we are developing an increased knowledge base about the characteristics and skills of effective change facilitators (Rutherford, 1985; Murphy, Huling-Austin & Stiegelbauer, 1986), relevant

professional development for facilitators is now more widely available. Thus, in addition to training teachers in how to use innovations, change efforts will also require that facilitators be selected and trained in how to facilitate teacher's movement to institutionalized innovation use.

Evaluation

The innovation that was expected to provide improved student outcomes is all too frequently evaluated one year after introducing it into schools. Student gains are assessed and, typically, the anticipated student gains are absent. Also typically absent, but not measured, is whether the innovation has become stabilized or institutionalized into teachers' classroom practice. Until the innovation is institutionalized and used by teachers in a way that can deliver the promised outcomes, it makes sense to delay summative evaluations of the innovation. When the minimal or maximum institutionalization criteria have been met by the teacher, student outcome evaluation is then reasonable. Further, these data about the teacher's degree of implementation of the innovation provide a means to understand and explain student outcome data, assuming the innovation makes a difference.

Policy Determination

For those who formulate policy, change as a process, with institutionalization as one of the subprocesses, is an important understanding. More specifically, policy makers need to appreciate the multiple phases of the process of change which contribute to and interrelate to institutionalization. Institutionalization must

be acknowledged as the goal to be reached through initiation and implementation activities. Further, institutionalization requires maintenance, and policy development must support this premise. The reality to be recognized is that institutionalization has its beginnings in the initiation phase of the change process; the various subprocesses are intertwined and must be attended to concurrently. Until policy makers take a broad view of the process of change, develop policies that support all of the subprocesses, and clearly articulate an operational definition of the "mature" implementor who has achieved institutionalization, we are not likely to achieve success in reaching institutionalization, which, of course, precludes maintaining it or continuation of it.

In Conclusion

Real attention by school improvers to the institutionalization phase of change has been long in coming. For decades it was widely expected that the initiation of a change in schools would somehow miraculously lead to its becoming a part of typical classroom or school practice.

When the "new" becomes familiar, "old," and routine--that's one way to view institutionalization, a process that typically is as long as its label. But what does it really mean as the goal of the process of change? How do you know when you're there, or that it is timely to expect full results of innovation use? That time, we believe, is correlated to how each user feels about and what they do with an innovation. Benchmarks and mileposts for assessing institutionalization at the individual user level have been presented in this paper. They provide definitions, measurement procedures and answers to questions

about whether or not and to what degree "they/we are using it" as an established and ongoing practice.

References

Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. (1978). Federal programs supporting educational change, vol. 8: Implementing and sustaining innovations. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Corbett, H., Dawson, J., & Firestone, W. (1982). To each its own: School context and school change. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools.

Crandall, D. and associates. (1982). People, policies and practices: Examining the chain of school improvement. Andover, MA: The NETWORK, Inc.

Ekholm, M., & Trier, U. (1985, draft). Institutionalization - some abstract annotations. Linkoping.

Fullan, M., & Park, P. (1980). Curriculum implementation: A resource guide. Ontario: Ministry of Education.

Fullan, M., Pomfret, A. (1977). Research on curriculum and instruction implementation. Review of Educational Research, 47 (1), 335-397.

Glaser, E. (1981). Durability of innovations in human service organizations. Knowledge, 3, 167-183.

Hall, G., George, A., & Rutherford, W. (1977). Measuring stages of concern about the innovation: A manual for use of the SoC questionnaire. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. The University of Texas at Austin.

Hall, G., & Hord, S. (1986). Configurations of school-based leadership teams (R&D Report #3223). Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Hall, G., & Loucks, S.F. (1977). A developmental model for determining whether or not the treatment really is implemented. American Educational Research Journal, 14(3), 263-276.

Hall, G., & Loucks, S.F. (1978). Innovation configurations: Analyzing the adaptations of innovations. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. The University of Texas at Austin.

Hall, G., & Loucks, S.F. (1981). Program definition and adaptation: Implications for inservice. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 14 (2), 46-58.

Hall, G., Loucks, S., Rutherford, W., & Newlove, B. (1975). Levels of use of the innovation: A framework for analyzing innovation adoption. The Journal of Teacher Education, 29 (1), 52-56.

Hall, G., Wallace, R., Jr., & Dossett, W. (1973). A developmental conceptualization of the adoption process within educational institutions (R&D Report #3006). Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. The University of Texas at Austin.

Howes, N. (1977). A contingency model for predicting institutionalization of innovations across divergent organizations. Albany: State University of New York.

Huling, L., Hall, G., Hord, S., & Rutherford, W. (1983). A Multi-dimensional approach for assessing implementation success (R&D Report #3157). Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal.

Loucks, S., Newlove, B., & Hall, G. (1975). Measuring levels of use of the innovation: A manual for trainers, interviewers, and raters. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. The University of Texas at Austin.

Louis, K., Rosenblum, S., & Molitor, J. (1981). Strategies for knowledge use and school improvement. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education.

Miles, M. (1983). Unraveling the mystery of institutionalization. Educational Leadership, 41 (3), 14-19.

Murphy, S., Huling-Austin, L., & Stiegelbauer, S. (1986). Selecting and and training educational leaders to be facilitators of school improvement. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Rogers, E., & Shoemaker, F. (1971). Communication of innovations. A cross-cultural approach. Toronto: Collier-MacMillan.

Rutherford, W. (1985). A composition program in three schools after four years. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. The University of Texas at Austin.

Rutherford, W. (1986). Teachers: Their contribution to school improvement. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Stiegelbauer, S., Muscella, D., & Rutherford, W. (1986). The facilitation of change in elementary and secondary schools -- similarities, differences, and interactions about the process. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Van Hees, T. (forthcoming). Institutionalization and the school's capacity to change. In E. Stego, S. Hord, R. Glatter, & K. Gielen (Eds.). The Role of School Leaders in School Improvement. Leuven, Belgium: Acco.

Yin, R., Quick, S., Bateman, P., & Marks, E. (1978). Changing urban bureaucracies: How new practices become routinized. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Yin, R., Quick, S., Bateman, P., & Marks, E. (1979). Changing urban bureaucracies: How new practices become routinized. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.